Decomposition of Quantum Markov Chains and Zero-error Capacity

Ji Guan, Yuan Feng and Mingsheng Ying

arXiv:1608.06024v1 [quant-ph] 22 Aug 2016

***Abstract*—Markov chains have been widely applied in information theory and various areas of its applications. Quantum Markov chains are a natural quantum extension of Markov chains. This paper studies irreducibility and periodicity of (discrete time) quantum Markov chains. In particular, we present a periodic decomposition and establish limit theorems for them. Using these mathematical tools, we give a new characterization of (one-shot) zero-error capacity of quantum channels.**

***Index Terms*—quantum Markov chains, irreducibility, periodicity, limiting states, decomposition, quantum channels, zero-error capacity.**

I. Introduction

A Markov chain is a random process with the property that, conditional on its present value, the future is independent of the past. Markov chains have been used as statistical models of real-world processes in a wide range of fields [1]. In particular, they have been extensively applied in information theory and various areas of its applications, for example, data compression, pattern recognition, state estimation and machine learning.

The notion of Markov chain, when properly generalized to the quantum world, provides a potential paradigm for modelling the evolution of quantum systems. Continuous-time quantum Markov processes have been intensively studied in mathematical physics for many years, and achieved several discoveries of fundamental importance. In quantum computing, a special class of quantum Markov chains, namely quantum walks, have been successfully used in the design of quantum algorithms (see [2], [3] for a survey of this line of research). More recently, discrete-time quantum Markov chains were introduced by the authors and their collaborators [4], [5], [6] as a semantic model for the purpose of verification and termination analysis of quantum programs.

This paper continues our studies of (discrete time) quantum Markov chains, but targeting an application to zero-error capacity of quantum channels. Roughly speaking, a quantum Markov chain is a reformulation of the ideas of a classical Markov chain, replacing the classical state space by a Hilbert space and the transition probability matrix by a super-operator, which is a mathematical formalism of the discrete-time evolution of (open) quantum systems, respectively. In [6], reachability of quantum Markov chains has been carefully studied, and in particular, a BSCC (bottom strongly connected components) decomposition technique was developed. In this paper, we introduce the notions of irreducible and periodic quantum Markov chains and present a periodic decomposition of quantum Markov chains. Furthermore, we give several characterizations of limiting states of quantum Markov chains in terms of aperiodicity, irreducibility and eigenvalues. Thus, several important results in the basic theory of Markov chains have been generalized to the quantum setting.

The notion of zero-error capacity of quantum channels is a straightforward but nontrivial generalization of the corresponding notion for classical channels introduced by Shannon in [7]. It is defined as the least upper bound of the rates at which one can send classical messages perfectly via a quantum channel [8]. As zero-error capacity is a fundamental quantity of quantum channels, it is desirable to find an efficient algorithm to compute it. However, it was proved by Beigi and Shorth [9] that even computing one-shot zero-error capacity is QMA-complete [10]. Recently, Duan, Severini and Winter [11] found an upper bound of zero-error capacity of quantum channels by introducing a notion of quantum Lovász number. The periodic decomposition of quantum Markov chains developed in this paper together with the BSCC decomposition presented in [6] provides us with a new angle to look at the structure of quantum channel. In particular, it gives a novel characterization of one-shot zero-error capacity for general quantum channels.

This paper is organized as follows. We review some basic notions and several useful results of quantum Markov chains from previous literature in Section II. In Section III, we extend the notions of irreducibility and aperiodicity for classical Markov chains to quantum Markov chains, and show that they coincide with the corresponding notions presented in the literature from different perspectives. We then carefully examine limiting states of irreducible and aperiodic quantum Markov chains, and a periodic decomposition of irreducible quantum Markov chains is presented. In Section IV, we consider general quantum Markov chains that may be reducible. A characterization of their limiting states is given in terms of BSCCs, and their structures are analyzed by combining the BSCC and periodic decompositions. In Section V, we study the zero-error capacity of quantum channels using the mathematical tools developed in previous sections. A brief conclusion is drawn in the last section.

Ji Guan and Yuan Feng are with the Center for Quantum Computation and Intelligent Systems, University of Technology Sydney, NSW 2007, Australia (e-mail:Ji.Guan@student.uts.edu.au and Yuan.Feng@uts.edu.au).

Mingsheng Ying is with the Center for Quantum Computation and Intelligent Systems, University of Technology Sydney, NSW 2007, Australia and Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China (e-mail:Mingsheng.Ying@uts.edu.au).

II. Quantum Markov Chains

In this section, for convenience of the reader, we review some basic notions and results of quantum Markov chains; for details we refer to [12]. Recall that a (classical) Markov chain is a random process of which the future behavior depends only on the present, and the evolution of such a process is modelled by a matrix of transition probabilities. Note that the evolution of an open quantum system can be modelled mathematically by a super-operator, i.e. a completely positive and trace-preserving (CPTP) map, acting on its state Hilbert space of the system. This naturally motivates us to introduce the following:

Definition 1 ([6]): A *quantum Markov chain* is a pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space, and $\mathcal{E}$ is a super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$.

In this paper, we only consider finite-dimensional quantum Markov chains. We use $B(\mathcal{H})$ and $D(\mathcal{H})$ to denote the linear operators acting on $\mathcal{H}$ and the set of density operators in $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. Then a *state* of a quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ is an operator $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$. The *support* of a density operator ρ, denoted $\text{supp}(\rho)$, is the subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ spanned by the eigenvectors of ρ corresponding to non-zero eigenvalues. The *image* of a subspace X of $\mathcal{H}$ under a super-operator $\mathcal{E}$ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{E}(X) := \bigvee_{|\phi\rangle \in X} \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|)).$$

Here $|\phi\rangle$ denotes a pure state in X, the join of a family $\{X_k\}$ of subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by $\bigvee_k X_k = \text{span}(\bigcup_k X_k)$, and $\text{span}(X) = \{\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i v_i \mid k \in \mathbb{N}, v_i \in X, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}\}$ is the space spanned by vectors in X. Subspace X is said to be invariant under $\mathcal{E}$ if $\mathcal{E}(X) \subseteq X$.

For any linear map $\mathcal{E}$ on $B(\mathcal{H})$, if $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = n$, then it admits up to n^2 distinct (complex) eigenvalues λ which satisfy

$$\mathcal{E}(A) = \lambda A$$

for some $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$, $A \neq 0$. We write $\text{spec}(\mathcal{E})$ for the set of all eigenvalues of $\mathcal{E}$. The *spectral radius* of $\mathcal{E}$ is defined as $\varrho(\mathcal{E}) := \sup\{|\lambda| | \lambda \in \text{spec}(\mathcal{E})\}$. In particular, if $\mathcal{E}$ is a CPTP map, then $\varrho(\mathcal{E}) = 1$.

Definition 2 ([5]): Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain. For any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, the *reachable space* of ρ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho) := \bigvee_{i=0}^{\infty} \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^i(\rho))$$

where $\mathcal{E}^i$ stands for the composition of i copies of $\mathcal{E}$, that is, $\mathcal{E}^0 = \mathcal{I}$, the identity super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$, and $\mathcal{E}^n = \mathcal{E}^{n-1} \circ \mathcal{E}$ for $n \geq 1$.

Intuitively, as its name suggested, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho)$ consists of all states that can be reached from the initial state ρ in the iterative evolution of the system modelled by $\mathcal{G}$.

The following lemmas will be useful in our later discussion.

Lemma 1 ([5]): For any quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, real number $p > 0$, $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, and X, Y being subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$, we have

(1) $\text{supp}(p\rho) = \text{supp}(\rho)$;
(2) $\mathcal{E}(\text{supp}(\rho)) = \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}(\rho))$;
(3) if $X \subseteq Y$, then $\mathcal{E}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(Y)$;
(4) $\mathcal{E}(X \bigvee Y) = \mathcal{E}(X) \bigvee \mathcal{E}(Y)$.

Lemma 2 ([5]): Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain and $n = \dim(\mathcal{H})$. Then for any state $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho) = \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^i(\rho)).$$

The above lemma indicates that all reachable states can be actually reached within n steps if $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = n$.

Definition 3 ([6]): For a quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, a state $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$ is called a *stationary state* if $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \rho$; that is, ρ is a fixed point of $\mathcal{E}$.

A central concept in the analysis of quantum Markov chains is strongly connected component. Before giving its definition, let us first introduce an auxiliary notation. Let X be a subspace of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and $\mathcal{E}$ be a super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ on X is defined to be a super-operator $\mathcal{E}|_X$ with $\mathcal{E}|_X(\rho) = P_X \mathcal{E}(\rho) P_X$ for all $\rho \in D(X)$, where P_X is the projector onto X.

Definition 4 ([6]): Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain. A subspace X of $\mathcal{H}$ is called *strongly connected* in $\mathcal{G}$ if for any $|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle \in X$, we have $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}_X}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ and $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}_X}(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|)$, where $\mathcal{G}_X$ denotes the quantum Markov chain $(X, \mathcal{E}|_X)$; that is, $|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle$ can be reached from another one.

Let $\text{SC}(\mathcal{G})$ be the set of all strongly connected subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ in $\mathcal{G}$. It is easy to see that the partial order $(\text{SC}(\mathcal{G}), \subseteq)$ is inductive. Then Zorn's lemma asserts that it has maximal elements. Each maximal element of $(\text{SC}(\mathcal{G}), \subseteq)$ is called a *strongly connected component (SCC)* of $\mathcal{G}$.

Definition 5 ([6]): Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain. Then a subspace X of $\mathcal{H}$ is called a bottom strongly connected component (BSCC) of $\mathcal{G}$ if it is a SCC and invariant in $\mathcal{G}$. Here X is said to be invariant in $\mathcal{G}$ if $\mathcal{E}(X) \subseteq X$.

Definition 6 ([6]): Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain. A subspace X of $\mathcal{H}$ is called a transient subspace if for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \text{tr}(P_X \mathcal{E}^n(\rho)) = 0 \tag{1}$$

where P_X is the projector onto X.

Intuitively, equation (1) means that the system will eventually go out of X no matter where it starts from.

The following theorem shows that a quantum Markov chain can be decomposed into a family of BSCCs together with a transient subspace.

Theorem 1 (BSCC Decomposition, [6]): For any quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, we have:

$$\mathcal{H} = B_0 \bigoplus \cdots \bigoplus B_{n-1} \bigoplus T_{\mathcal{E}} \tag{2}$$

where B_i's are mutually orthogonal BSCCs of $\mathcal{G}$ and $T_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the largest transient subspace in $\mathcal{G}$.

Note that in [13], a similar decomposition was presented by considering *minimal stationary ranges*, which correspond closely to our notion of BSCCs, for quantum dynamical semigroups.

We will also need several notations defined in [14]. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a super-operator with Kraus operators $\{E_i\}$, i.e. $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) = \sum_i E_i \cdot E_i^\dagger$. Then its matrix representation is defined to be $M = \sum_i E_i \otimes E_i^*$. Assume that $M = SJS^{-1}$ is the Jordan decomposition of M, where

$$J = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda_k P_k + N_k,$$

$N_k^{d_k} = 0$ for some $d_k > 0$, $N_k P_k = P_k N_k = N_k, P_k P_l = \delta_{kl} P_k, \mathrm{tr}(P_k) = d_k$, and $\sum_k P_k = I$. Let

$$J_\infty := \sum_{k:\lambda_k=1} P_k, \tag{3}$$

$$J_\phi := \sum_{k:|\lambda_k|=1} P_k. \tag{4}$$

Then we write:

- $\mathcal{E}_\infty$ for the super-operator with the matrix representation $SJ_\infty S^{-1}$.
- $\mathcal{E}_\phi$ for the super-operator with the matrix representation $SJ_\phi S^{-1}$.

The following interesting characterizations of $\mathcal{E}_\infty$ and $\mathcal{E}_\phi$ are crucial for our later discussion.

Lemma 3 ([14, Proposition 6.3]): For any quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$,

(1) there exists an increasing sequence of integers n_i such that $\mathcal{E}_\phi = \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^{n_i}$;
(2) $\mathcal{E}_\infty = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathcal{E}^n$.

III. Irreducibility and Periodicity

Recall from classical probability theory that an irreducible Markov chain starting from a state i can reach any other state j in a finite number of steps. The notion of irreducibility can be straightforwardly extended to quantum Markov chains using the concept of reachable space introduced in Definition 2.

Definition 7: A quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ is called *irreducible* if for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{G}(\rho) = \mathcal{H}$.

From Lemma 2, it can be easily shown that the above definition indeed coincides with the irreducibility given in [14, Theorem 6.2] for quantum channels, but our definition serves as a more natural extension of irreducibility for classical Markov chains.

To illustrate irreducibility, let us see two simple examples.

Example 1: Consider a natural way to encode the NOT gate

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

into a quantum channel. Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{span}\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. The super-operator $\mathcal{E} : D(\mathcal{H}) \to D(\mathcal{H})$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = |1\rangle\langle 0|\rho|0\rangle\langle 1| + |0\rangle\langle 1|\rho|1\rangle\langle 0|$$

for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$. It is easy to check that quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ is irreducible.

Example 2 (Amplitude-damping channel): Consider the 2-dimensional amplitude-damping channel modelling the physical processes such as spontaneous emission. Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{span}\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, and

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = E_0 \rho E_0^\dagger + E_1 \rho E_1^\dagger$$

where $E_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{1-p}|1\rangle\langle 1|$ and $E_1 = \sqrt{p}|0\rangle\langle 1|$ with $p > 0$. Then quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ is reducible since, say, $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{G}(|0\rangle\langle 0|) = \mathrm{span}\{|0\rangle\}$.

For a quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, we see from [6, Lemma 3] that $\mathcal{G}$ is irreducible if and only if the state Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ itself is a BSCC of $\mathcal{G}$. Therefore, the uniqueness of BSCCs can be applied to check whether $\mathcal{G}$ is irreducible.

Theorem 2: A quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ has a unique BSCC B if and only if it has a unique stationary state ρ^*. Furthermore, $\mathrm{supp}(\rho^*) = B$.

Proof: We see from Definition 6 that for any stationary state ρ and transient subspace T of $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \cap T = \emptyset$. Then the result immediately follows from [6, Theorem 2]. □

Corollary 1: A quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ is irreducible if and only if it has a unique stationary state ρ^* with $\mathrm{supp}(\rho^*) = \mathcal{H}$.

Different versions of this corollary and its special cases are known in [14] and [15]. It is clear that checking irreducibility of a given quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ can be done by checking whether $\mathcal{H}$ itself is a BSCC using Algorithm 1 in [6] with time $O(n^6)$, where $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = n$.

In the following, we generalize the notion of periodicity of Markov chains to quantum Markov chains.

Definition 8: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain.

(1) A state $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$ is called *aperiodic* if

$$\gcd\{m \geq 1 : \mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{E}^m(\rho))\} = 1.$$

Here, gcd stands for the greatest common divisor; in particular, we assume that $\gcd(\emptyset) = 0$.
(2) A subspace X of $\mathcal{H}$ is aperiodic if each density operator ρ with $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq X$ is aperiodic.

Definition 9: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain.

(1) If there exists an integer $d \geq 1$ such that the whole state space $\mathcal{H}$ is aperiodic in quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G}^d = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E}^d)$, then the minimum of such integers d, denoted $d(\mathcal{G})$, is called the *period* of $\mathcal{G}$.
(2) When $d(\mathcal{G}) = 1$, $\mathcal{G}$ is said to be *aperiodic*; otherwise, it is *periodic*.

Note that for the special case of irreducible quantum Markov chains, periodicity was already defined in [16] based on the notion of $\mathcal{E}$-cyclic resolution:

Definition 10: For a quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, let $(P_0, \cdots, P_{d-1})$ be a resolution of identity, i.e. a family of orthogonal projectors such that $\sum_{k=0}^{d-1} P_k = I$. Then $(P_0, \cdots, P_{d-1})$ is said to be $\mathcal{E}$-cyclic if $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(P_k) = P_{k\boxminus 1}$ for $k = 0, \cdots, d-1$, where $\boxminus$ denotes subtraction modulo d and $\mathcal{E}^\dagger$ is the adjoin map of $\mathcal{E}$.

The next theorem shows that the period defined in [16] and that in Definition 9 are the same for irreducible quantum Markov chains. Actually, the former can be better understood in the Heisenberg picture, and the latter in the Schrödinger picture.

Theorem 3: For an irreducible quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, the period of $\mathcal{G}$ is equal to the supremum of integers c for which there exists a $\mathcal{E}$-cyclic resolution $(P_0, \cdots, P_{c-1})$ of identity.

Proof: By [14, Theorem 6.6], the supremum of all c for which there exists a $\mathcal{E}$-cyclic resolution $(P_0, \cdots, P_{c-1})$ of identity is the number of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{E}$ with magnitude one. Then the result follows from Theorem 6 in the following. □

The notion of periodicity is further illustrated by the following example.

Example 3: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ with $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle\}$ and for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\rho) = |1+2\rangle\langle 0|\rho|0\rangle\langle 1+2| &+ |0+2\rangle\langle 1|\rho|1\rangle\langle 0+2| \\ &+ |1+0\rangle\langle 2|\rho|2\rangle\langle 1+0|\end{aligned}$$

where $|i+j\rangle = (|i\rangle + |j\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ for $i, j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Then it is easy to see that $\mathcal{G}$ is irreducible and aperiodic, and has the unique stationary state

$$\frac{1}{3}(|1+2\rangle\langle 1+2| + |0+2\rangle\langle 0+2| + |1+0\rangle\langle 1+0|).$$

The following lemma presents a useful characterization of reachable space starting from a state within an aperiodic subspace. It can be seen as a strengthened version of Lemma 2 in the special case of aperiodic quantum Markov chains.

Lemma 4: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain and X an subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(1) X is an aperiodic subspace of $\mathcal{H}$;

(2) For any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$ with $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq X$, there exists an integer $M(\rho) > 0$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^m(\rho)) = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho)$ for all $m \geq M(\rho)$.

Proof: (2) ⇒ (1) is obvious. So, we only need to show that (1) ⇒ (2). Fix an arbitrary ρ with $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq X$. For each $i \geq 0$, let $X_i = \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^i(\rho))$. In particular, $X_0 = \text{supp}(\rho)$. Let $T_\rho = \{i \geq 1 : X_i \supseteq X_0\}$. Then from Lemma 1, we have: for any $i, j \geq 0$,

$$X_{i+j} = \mathcal{E}^i(X_j); \text{ and} \tag{5}$$

$$\text{if } i, j \in T_\rho, \text{ then } i + j \in T_\rho. \tag{6}$$

By the assumption that X is aperiodic, we have $\gcd(T_\rho) = 1$. Then from [17], there is a finite subset $\{m_k\}_{k\in K}$ of T_ρ, $\gcd\{m_k\}_{k\in K} = 1$, and an integer $M'(\rho) > 0$ such that for any $i \geq M'(\rho)$, there exist positive integers $\{a_k\}_{k\in K}$ such that $i = \sum_{k\in K} a_k m_k$. Thus $i \in T_\rho$ from Eq. (6).

Now let $M(\rho) := M'(\rho) + n - 1$ where $n = \dim(\mathcal{H})$, and take any $m \geq M(\rho)$. For all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, we have shown that $m - i \in T_\rho$; that is, $X_{m-i} \supseteq X_0$. Thus $X_m \supseteq X_i$ from Eq. (5), and $X_m \supseteq \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho)$ from Lemma 2. Therefore, $X_m = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho)$, as the reverse inclusion trivially holds. □

Combining the above lemma with Definition 7, we have:

Corollary 2: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be an irreducible and aperiodic quantum Markov chain and $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = n$. Then for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, there exists an integer $M(\rho) > 0$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^m(\rho)) = \mathcal{H}$ for all $m \geq M(\rho)$.

The above corollary shows that starting from any state ρ, an irreducible and aperiodic quantum Markov chain can reach the whole state space after a finite number of steps. Then it is interesting to see when the whole space can be reached for the first time.

Definition 11: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be an irreducible and aperiodic quantum Markov chain. For each $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, the saturation time of ρ is defined to be

$$s(\rho) = \inf\{n \geq 1 \mid \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^n(\rho)) = \mathcal{H}\}.$$

It is clear from Corollary 2 that the infimum in the defining equation of $s(\rho)$ can always be attained. We are going to show that for an irreducible and aperiodic quantum Markov chain, the saturation time for any initial state has a *universal* upper bound. For this purpose, the following technical lemmas are needed.

Lemma 5: If $\mathcal{F}$ is a CP map with $\mathcal{F}(\cdot) = \sum_i F_i \cdot F_i^\dagger$ and $\sum_i F_i^\dagger F_i \leq I$, then for any Hermitian matrix A,

$$\|\mathcal{F}(A)\|_1 \leq \|A\|_1$$

Proof: Let $\mathcal{F}(A) = Q_+ - Q_-$ and $A = P_+ - P_-$ be decompositions into orthogonal parts $Q_\pm \geq 0$ and $P_\pm \geq 0$. By projecting the equation $Q_+ - Q_- = \mathcal{F}(P_+ - P_-)$ onto the support space of Q_+ (or Q_-), we obtain:

$$\text{tr}(Q_\pm) \leq \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}(P_\pm)) \leq (P_\pm).$$

Therefore, $\|\mathcal{F}(A)\|_1 \leq \|A\|_1$. □

Lemma 6 ([18]): Let $S(\mathcal{H})$ denote the set of all subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$. Then for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\inf_{X \in S(\mathcal{H})\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}} \text{tr}(P_X \rho) = \lambda_{min}(\rho)$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero-dimensional subspace, P_X is the projector onto X and $\lambda_{min}(\rho)$ is the minimum eigenvalue of ρ.

Now we are ready to present one of the main results of this section, which gives a characterization of irreducibility and aperiodicity.

Theorem 4: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain and X be an invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(1) $\mathcal{G}_X = (X, \mathcal{E}|_X)$ is irreducible and aperiodic;

(2) There exists an integer $M > 0$ such that for all $\rho \in D(X)$, $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^m(\rho)) = X$ for all $m \geq M$.

Proof: (2) ⇒ (1) is obvious. So, we only need to show that (1) ⇒ (2). Let $s_X(\rho)$ be the saturation time of ρ in $\mathcal{G}_X$. Then for any $\rho \in D(X)$, let

$$B(\rho) = \{\sigma \in D(X) \mid \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 < \bar{\lambda}_{min}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\rho))\},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the trace norm and $\bar{\lambda}_{min}(\rho)$ is the minimum non-zero eigenvalue of ρ. Obviously, $B(\rho)$ is an open set. Then $\{B(\rho)\}_{\rho\in D(X)}$ is an open cover of $D(X)$. As $D(X)$ is compact, we can find a finite number of density operators $\{\rho_i\}_{i\in J}$ such that

$$D(X) = \bigcup_{i\in J} B(\rho_i).$$

In the following, we show for any $\rho \in D(X)$ and $\sigma \in B(\rho)$, $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^m(\sigma)) = X$ for all $m \geq s(\rho)$. Then the theorem holds by taking $M = \max_{i\in J} s_X(\rho_i)$.

Let $Y = \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\sigma))$, P_Y be the projector onto Y. As X is invariant, $Y \subseteq X$. Then let $P_{\bar{Y}} = I_X - P_Y$, where I_X is the identity operator on X. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(P_{\bar{Y}}\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\rho)) &= \|P_{\bar{Y}}\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\rho)P_{\bar{Y}}\|_1 \\ &= \|P_{\bar{Y}}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\rho) - \mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\sigma))P_{\bar{Y}}\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\rho) - \mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\sigma)\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \\ &< \bar{\lambda}_{min}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

The first two inequalities follows from Lemma 5.

By Lemma 6 and X is invariant, this is only possible when $Y = X$. In other words, $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\sigma)) = X$. Thus $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)-1}(\sigma)) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\sigma))$, and $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)}(\sigma)) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)+1}(\sigma))$ from Lemma 1. So $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^{s_X(\rho)+1}(\sigma)) = X$. By induction, we can show that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^m(\sigma)) = X$ for all $m \geq s_X(\rho)$. □

It is worth noting that integer M in the above theorem does not depends on state ρ. This makes it much stronger than Lemma 4. Considering the whole state space, we have:

Corollary 3: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(1) $\mathcal{G}$ is irreducible and aperiodic;
(2) There exists an integer $M > 0$ such that for all $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^m(\rho)) = \mathcal{H}$ for all $m \geq M$.

Note that the minimal M in the above satisfies $M \leq n^4$ from [14, Theorem 6.9], where $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = n$. As a direct application of the above corollary, a quantum Markov chain is irreducible and aperiodic if and only if it is primitive. Here the notion of primitivity is defined in [14, Theorem 6.7]. Then a limit theorem can be easily obtained:

Theorem 5 (Limit Theorem): Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(1) $\mathcal{G}$ has a *limiting state* ρ^* with $\text{supp}(\rho^*) = \mathcal{H}$ in the sense that
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n(\rho) = \rho^*, \ \forall \rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}).$$
(2) $\mathcal{G}$ is irreducible and aperiodic;
(3) 1 is the only eigenvalue of $\mathcal{E}$ with magnitude one and the corresponding eigenvector is $\rho^* > 0$.

Proof: Direct from [14, Theorem 6.7], by noting that irreducibility plus aperiodicity are equivalent to primitivity. □

Generally, aperiodicity can be determined by the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{E}$ without the assumption of irreducibility.

Lemma 7: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain with a trivial transient subspace; that is, $T_{\mathcal{E}} = \{0\}$ in the decomposition in Eq. (2). If $\mathcal{E}$ has only 1 as its eigenvalue with magnitude one, then $\mathcal{G}$ must be aperiodic.

Proof: By Theorem 1, the state space of $\mathcal{G}$ can be decomposed into BSCCs:

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} B_i$$

As B_i is a BSCC and $\text{spec}(\mathcal{E}|_{B_i}) \subseteq \text{spec}(\mathcal{E})$, by Corollary 1, 1 is a simple and unique eigenvalue of $\mathcal{E}|_{B_i}$ with magnitude one. Then by [14, Theorem 6.7] and Theorem 5, $(B_i, \mathcal{E}|_{B_i})$ is irreducible and aperiodic. Let $\{E_k\}$ be a set of Kraus operators of $\mathcal{E}$. According to the BSCC decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$, E_k has the block structure $E_k = \text{diag}(E_{k,0}, \cdots, E_{k,n-1})$.

For any pure state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{j\in J} |\psi_j\rangle$, where $J \subseteq \{0, \cdots, n-1\}$ such that $|\psi_j\rangle \in B_j$ and $|\psi_j\rangle \neq 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^n(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) &= \bigoplus_{j\in J} \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}_j^n(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|)) \\ &= \bigoplus_{j\in J} \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^n(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|)) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_j(\cdot) = \sum_k E_{k,j} \cdot E_{k,j}^\dagger$.

As $(B_j, \mathcal{E}|_{B_j})$ is irreducible and aperiodic, by Theorem 4, we assert that there exists an integer $N > 0$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^n(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|)) = B_j$ for all $j \in J$ and $n \geq N$. Therefore, $\text{supp}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \subseteq \bigoplus_{j\in J} B_j = \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^n(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|))$ for any $n \geq N$. Then by Definition 8, $|\psi\rangle$ is aperiodic. Consequently, $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ is aperiodic from the arbitrariness of $|\psi\rangle$. □

The next theorem shows that the period of an irreducible quantum Markov chain is exactly the number of the eigenvalues of the super-operator with magnitude one.

Theorem 6: For an irreducible quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, the period of $\mathcal{G}$ equals the number of eigenvalues of $\mathcal{E}$ with magnitude one.

Proof: Let m be the number of eigenvalues of $\mathcal{E}$ with magnitude one and d the period of $\mathcal{G}$. By [14, Theorem 6.6], 1 is the only element in $\text{spec}(\mathcal{E}^m)$ with magnitude one. As $\mathcal{G}$ is irreducible, $\mathcal{G}^m = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E}^m)$ has only a trivial transient subspace by Corollary 1. Then with Lemma 7, $\mathcal{G}^m = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E}^m)$ is aperiodic, and hence $d \leq m$.

We now turn to prove that $d \geq m$. The case when $m = 1$ is trivial. Suppose $m \geq 2$. By [14, Theorem 6.6], there exists a $\mathcal{E}$-cyclic resolution of identity $(P_0, \cdots, P_{m-1})$. As $\mathcal{G}^d = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E}^d)$ is aperiodic, there exists an integer $N' > 0$ such that $\text{supp}(P_k) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}^{dn}(P_k))$ for all $n \geq N'$. So $\forall n \geq N'$

$$0 < \text{tr}(P_k\mathcal{E}^{dn}(P_k)) = \text{tr}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger^{dn}}(P_k)P_k) = \text{tr}(P_{k\boxminus dn}P_k) \quad (7)$$

where $\boxminus$ denotes subtraction modulo m. Therefore, m must be a factor of d and $m \leq d$. □

Theorem 6 indicates that every irreducible quantum Markov chain has a period and also offers an efficient algorithm for computing the period through counting the number of eigenvalues of the super-operator.

We now turn to develop a decomposition technique for irreducible quantum Markov chains.

Theorem 7 (Periodic Decomposition): The state space of an irreducible quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ can be decomposed into the direct sum of some orthogonal subspaces:

$$\mathcal{H} = B_0 \bigoplus \cdots \bigoplus B_{d-1}$$

with the following properties:

(1) $\mathcal{E}(B_{i\boxminus 1}) = B_i$; and
(2) $(B_i, \mathcal{E}^d|_{B_i})$ is irreducible and aperiodic;

where B_i's are mutually orthogonal subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ and invariant under $\mathcal{E}^d$, d is the period of $\mathcal{G}$, and $\boxminus$ denotes subtraction modulo d.

Proof: This follows from the proof of Theorem 6. □

IV. Limit theorem and decomposition for generic quantum Markov chains

Irreducible quantum Markov chains were carefully examined in the last section. In this section, we consider general quantum Markov chains that might be reducible.

Theorem 8: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain, and $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^g$ be an orthonormal basis for the eigenspace of $\lambda = 1$ with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(1) For any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n(\rho)$ exists. In this case, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^g \mathrm{tr}(A_i^\dagger \rho) A_i$;
(2) 1 is the only eigenvalue of $\mathcal{E}$ with magnitude one.

Proof: If 1 is the only eigenvalue with magnitude one, then $\mathcal{E}_\phi = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n$. As J_ϕ is diagonal, by definition, $\mathcal{E}_\phi$ has (at most) two distinct eigenvalues 1 and 0. Let $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be an orthonormal basis for the eigenspace of $\lambda = 0$, so $\{A_i, B_j\}$ is an orthonormal basis. Then for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^g \mathrm{tr}(A_i^\dagger \rho) A_i + \sum_{i=1}^k \mathrm{tr}(B_i^\dagger \rho) B_i$$

Thus

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^g \mathrm{tr}(A_i^\dagger \rho) A_i.$$

On the other hand, if for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n(\rho)$ exists, then

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi(\rho) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n(\rho) = \mathcal{E}(\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n(\rho)) = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}_\phi(\rho)).$$

So, $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \mathcal{E}_\phi$. Note that the corresponding Jordan norm forms of $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}_\phi)$ and $\mathcal{E}_\phi$ are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} JJ_\phi &= \sum_{k:|\lambda_k|=1} \lambda_k P_k \\ J_\phi &= \sum_{k:|\lambda_k|=1} P_k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, whenever $|\lambda_k| = 1$ it actually holds $\lambda_k = 1$. □

Note that a special case of Theorem 8 where $\mathcal{E}$ is unital was proved in [19]. The following theorem considers the case when the limiting state is unique.

Theorem 9: For any quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, the following statements are equivalent:

(1) There is a limiting state ρ^*, i.e. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n(\rho) = \rho^*$ for all $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$. Especially, if $\mathcal{E}$ is unital, then $\rho^* = I/d$;
(2) $\mathcal{H}$ contains a unique BSCC B and $(B, \mathcal{E}|_B)$ is aperiodic;
(3) 1 is the only eigenvalue of $\mathcal{E}$ with magnitude one and its geometric multiplicity is 1.

Proof: As limiting states must be stationary states, the equivalence of (1) and (3) can be easily obtained by Theorem 8 and [14, Corollary 6.5].

(1) ⇒ (2) is easy. If $\mathcal{H}$ has two BSCCs, then there are two stationary states. This contradicts to the uniqueness of limiting state. As limiting states must be stationary, by Theorem 2, $\mathrm{supp}(\rho^*) = B$. With Theorem 5, $(B, \mathcal{E}|_B)$ is aperiodic.

(2) ⇒ (3) As $\mathcal{E}_\phi = \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^{n_i}$, we see from Definition 6 that for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{E}_\phi(\rho)) \subseteq B$. $(B, \mathcal{E}|_B)$ is irreducible and aperiodic, so for any $\rho \in D(B)$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^n(\rho) = \rho^*$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\rho^*) = B$, and $\mathcal{E}_\phi(\rho) = \rho^*$. With $\mathcal{E}_\phi \circ \mathcal{E}_\phi = \mathcal{E}_\phi$, we have that for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{E}_\phi(\rho) = \rho^*$ and ρ^* is the only stationary state of $\mathcal{E}_\phi$. By the definition of $\mathcal{E}_\phi$, the stationary states of $\mathcal{E}$ are also stationary states of $\mathcal{E}_\phi$, so 1 is the only eigenvalue of $\mathcal{E}$ with magnitude one and its geometric multiplicity is 1. □

To conclude this section, we consider a two-step decomposition of a quantum Markov chain. For any quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$, we first use Theorem 1 to decompose $\mathcal{H}$ into $\mathcal{H} = B_0 \bigoplus \cdots \bigoplus B_{n-1} \bigoplus T_\mathcal{E}$. It was proved in [6] that although the BSCC decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$ is not unique, the number n of BSCCs for different decompositions are the same. Furthermore, for each i, we can employ Theorem 7 to decompose B_i into d_i aperiodic subspaces, where d_i is the period of B_i. Then a question naturally arises: are the sum $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d_i$ of the periods of BSCCs the same for different decompositions? We will give a positive answer to this question by using the following:

Lemma 8: Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain. Assume that C is a *minimal* invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ which allows for decompositions into different BSCCs; that is, no proper subspaces of C have different BSCC decompositions. Then for any BSCCs X and Y contained in C, we have $d(X) = d(Y)$, where $d(\cdot)$ denotes the period of $\mathcal{E}$ when restricting to the corresponding subspace.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ spanned by all BSCCs. For any subspace Z of $\mathcal{H}$, let P_Z be the projector onto Z and $\mathcal{P}_Z$ be super-operator with $\mathcal{P}_Z(\cdot) = P_Z \cdot P_Z$. Then $\mathcal{E}|_Z = \mathcal{P}_Z \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_Z$. By [13, Corollary 23], we can find a unitary U such that

(1) $P_Y = U P_X U^\dagger$ (thus $\mathcal{P}_Y = \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{P}_X \circ \mathcal{U}^\dagger$ where $\mathcal{U}(\cdot) = U \cdot U^\dagger$); and
(2) for any linear operator A with $A = \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R}(A)$, $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger \circ \mathcal{U}(A) = \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger(A)$.

For any orthogonal projectors $P_0, \cdots, P_{d-1}$ such that $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} P_i = P_X$ and $\mathcal{E}_X^\dagger(P_i) = \mathcal{P}_X \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger(P_i) = P_{i\boxminus 1}$, where $\boxminus$ denotes subtraction modulo d, let $P'_0, \cdots, P'_{d-1}$ be orthogonal projectors with $P'_i = \mathcal{U}(P_i)$. Then for any i,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}|_Y^\dagger(P'_i) &= \mathcal{P}_Y \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger \circ \mathcal{P}_Y \circ \mathcal{U}(P_i) = \mathcal{P}_Y \circ \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger \circ \mathcal{U}(P_i) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_Y \circ \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger(P_i) = \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{P}_X \circ \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger(P_i) \\ &= \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{P}_X \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger(P_i) = \mathcal{U}(P_{i\boxminus 1}) = P'_{i\boxminus 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $d(X) \le d(Y)$. By a symmetric argument, we can show that $d(Y) \le d(X)$ as well. □

Now we can easily prove the following:

Corollary 4: Let a quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ have two different BSCC decompositions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= B_0 \bigoplus \cdots \bigoplus B_{n-1} \bigoplus T_\mathcal{E} \\ &= B'_0 \bigoplus \cdots \bigoplus B'_{n-1} \bigoplus T_\mathcal{E} \end{aligned}$$

and let d_i (resp. d'_i) be the period of $\mathcal{E}$ restricting on B_i (resp. B'_i). Then

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d_i = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d'_i.$$

V. One-shot zero-error capacity

A combination of the BSCC and periodic decompositions of quantum Markov chains is studied in the last section. In this section, we show some interesting connections between it and the zero-error capacity of quantum channels.

Definition 12: For a quantum channel modelled by a super-operator $\mathcal{E}$, its *one-shot zero-error capacity* is the maximum integer n for which there exists a set of states $\{\rho_0, \cdots, \rho_{n-1}\}$ such that $\{\mathcal{E}(\rho_0), \cdots, \mathcal{E}(\rho_{n-1})\}$ can be perfectly distinguished; that is, they are mutually orthogonal.

Let us first fix several notations: for a super-operator $\mathcal{E}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, we write:

- $\alpha(\mathcal{E})$ for the one-shot zero-error capacity of quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$;
- $\beta(\mathcal{E})$ the sum of the periods of all BSCCs in quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$. From Corollary 4, $\beta(\mathcal{E})$ is well-defined;
- $\gamma(\mathcal{E})$ the number of BSCCs in quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$. The well-definedness of $\gamma(\mathcal{E})$ comes from [6, Theorem 6].

We first show a technical lemma which is useful for our later discussion.

Lemma 9: For any super-operators $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$, if $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}$ then $\alpha(\mathcal{F}) \leq \gamma(\mathcal{E})$.

Proof: Suppose $\{\rho_i : 1 \leq i \leq \alpha(\mathcal{F})\}$ is a set of states such that $\mathcal{F}(\rho_i)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\rho_j)$ are orthogonal whenever $i \neq j$. From $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}$, each $\mathcal{F}(\rho_i)$ is a fixed point state of $\mathcal{E}$, and its support contains a BSCC. Hence, $\alpha(\mathcal{F}) \leq \gamma(\mathcal{E})$. □

The next lemma collects some relations between the three quantities $\alpha(\mathcal{E})$, $\beta(\mathcal{E})$, and $\gamma(\mathcal{E})$ for different variants ($\mathcal{E}_\infty$ and $\mathcal{E}_\phi$ defined by Eqs. (3) and (4), respectively) of a super-operator $\mathcal{E}$.

Lemma 10: Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then

(1) $\alpha(\mathcal{E}) \geq \beta(\mathcal{E}) \geq \gamma(\mathcal{E})$;
(2) $\mathcal{E}_\phi \circ \mathcal{E}_\phi = \mathcal{E}_\phi$, $\mathcal{E}_\infty \circ \mathcal{E}_\infty = \mathcal{E}_\infty$, and $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}_\infty = \mathcal{E}_\infty$;
(3) $\alpha(\mathcal{E}_\infty) = \beta(\mathcal{E}_\infty) = \gamma(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \leq \mathrm{tr}(J_\infty)$;
(4) $\alpha(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \beta(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \gamma(\mathcal{E}_\phi) \leq \mathrm{tr}(J_\phi)$.

Proof: (1) and (2) are easy to check, and the first part of (3) and (4) follows immediately from (1), (2) and Lemma 9. □

The following example shows the two inequalities in Lemma 10 hold strictly in general.

Example 4: Consider a quantum Markov chain $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ with state space $\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{span}\{|0\rangle, \cdots, |3\rangle\}$ and the super-operator $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{4} E_i \cdot E_i^\dagger$, where:

$$E_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle\langle 0+1| + |2\rangle\langle 2+3|),$$
$$E_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle\langle 0-1| + |2\rangle\langle 2-3|),$$
$$E_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle\langle 0+1| + |3\rangle\langle 2+3|),$$
$$E_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle\langle 0-1| + |3\rangle\langle 2-3|),$$

$|0 \pm 1\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|2 \pm 3\rangle = (|2\rangle \pm |3\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. It is easy to see that the matrix representation of $\mathcal{E}$ is diagonalizable and, 1 and 0 are the only eigenvalues of $\mathcal{E}$ with algebraic multiplicities being 4 and 12, respectively. So $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_\infty = \mathcal{E}_\phi$ and $\mathrm{tr}(J_\phi) = \mathrm{tr}(J_\infty) = 4$. Moreover, we can easily obtain that $\alpha(\mathcal{E}) = 2$, so $\alpha(\mathcal{E}_\infty) = \alpha(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = 2$.

A more interesting relation between $\alpha(\mathcal{E})$, $\beta(\mathcal{E})$, $\gamma(\mathcal{E})$ is established in the following theorem:

Theorem 10: Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\alpha(\mathcal{E}_\infty) = \gamma(\mathcal{E}) \text{ and } \alpha(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \beta(\mathcal{E}).$$

Proof: Note that $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha(\mathcal{E}^i)$ for any $n \geq 1$. Thus, $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) \leq \alpha(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$. The reverse inequality follows from Lemma 10(2) and Lemma 9. So, $\alpha(\mathcal{E}_\infty) = \gamma(\mathcal{E})$.

Let $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} B_i \bigoplus T_\mathcal{E}$ be a BSCC decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$ according to $\mathcal{E}$ where $T_\mathcal{E}$ is the transient subspace. Furthermore, each B_i can be decomposed into d_i orthogonal subspaces $B_i = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{d_i-1} B_{i,j}$ such that for each j, $\mathcal{E}(B_{i,j}) = B_{i,j\boxplus 1}$ where $\boxplus$ denotes addition modulo d_i. Then we have:

Claim: for any $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq j \leq d_i - 1$, $B_{i,j}$ is a BSCC of $\mathcal{E}_\phi$.

It is easy to see that B_i is an invariant subspace under $\mathcal{E}_\phi$, and by [14, Theorem 6.6], for any $\rho \in D(B_i)$, $\mathcal{E}_\phi|_{B_i}(\rho) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^{d_i n}(\rho)$. Then by Theorem 7, $(B_{i,j}, \mathcal{E}^{d_i}|_{B_{i,j}})$ is irreducible and aperiodic, so $B_{i,j}$ is also an invariant subspace under $\mathcal{E}_\phi$. By invoking Theorem 5, we obtain that for any $\rho \in D(B_{i,j})$

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi(\rho) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^{d_i n}(\rho) = \rho^*_{i,j}$$

where $\rho^*_{i,j}$ is the limiting state for $(B_{i,j}, \mathcal{E}^{d_i}|_{B_{i,j}})$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\rho^*_{i,j}) = B_{i,j}$. Therefore, $\rho^*_{i,j}$ is the unique stationary state in $D(B_{i,j})$ and $B_{i,j}$ is a BSCC of $\mathcal{E}_\phi$, following [6, Theorem 2].

With this claim and noting that $T_\mathcal{E}$ is also the transient subspace of $\mathcal{E}_\phi$, we immediately know that $\gamma(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \beta(\mathcal{E})$. Then $\alpha(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \beta(\mathcal{E})$ follows from Lemma 10(4). □

By the above theorem, a way to check the uniqueness of the BSCC and periodic decompositions can be obtained.

Lemma 11: Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then

(1) $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \mathrm{tr}(J_\infty)$ if and only if the periodic decomposition of $\mathcal{E}$ is unique;
(2) $\beta(\mathcal{E}) = \mathrm{tr}(J_\phi)$ if and only if the BSCC decomposition of $\mathcal{E}$ is unique.

Proof. It is easy to see that $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \mathrm{tr}(J_\infty)$ if and only if there are no *stationary coherences* between the BSCCs of $\mathcal{E}$ in the sense of [13]. Also by [13, Theorem 7], the BSCC decomposition of $\mathcal{E}$ is unique if and only if there are no stationary coherences between the BSCCs of $\mathcal{E}$. By the same argument and noting from the proof of Theorem 10 that the periodic decomposition of $\mathcal{E}$ coincides with the BSCC decomposition of $\mathcal{E}_\phi$, we derive that $\gamma(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \mathrm{tr}(J_\phi)$ if and only if the periodic decomposition of $\mathcal{E}$ is unique. Then we complete the proof by noting $\gamma(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \beta(\mathcal{E})$. □

As a consequence of Lemma 11, combining with Theorem 6 and [14, Theorem 6.6], we can claim that the periodic decomposition of irreducible quantum Markov chains is unique.

Furthermore, we consider the limit of one-shot zero-error capacity of the composition of multiple copies of channel $\mathcal{E}$.

Theorem 11: Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\inf_n \alpha(\mathcal{E}^n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha(\mathcal{E}^n) = \beta(\mathcal{E}).$$

Proof: We first note that $\{\alpha(\mathcal{E}^n)\}$ is a decreasing sequence and $\alpha(\mathcal{E}^n) \geq 1$ for all $n \geq 1$. So, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha(\mathcal{E}^n)$ exists and $\inf_n \alpha(\mathcal{E}^n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha(\mathcal{E}^n)$. By Lemma 3, there exists an increasing sequence $\{n_i\}$ such that $\mathcal{E}_\phi = \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathcal{E}^{n_i}$. Thus $\lim_{i\to\infty} \alpha(\mathcal{E}^{n_i}) = \alpha(\mathcal{E}_\phi)$ and $\alpha(\mathcal{E}_\phi) = \beta(\mathcal{E})$, and finally we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha(\mathcal{E}^n) = \beta(\mathcal{E})$. □

The significance of Theorem 11 can be better understood by considering the following scenario: Suppose Alice wants to send messages to Bob by a quantum communication over a long distance ($\geq$ 1000 km, say, from Beijing to Sydney). Due to fibre attenuation and operation errors accumulated over the entire communication distance, they can not communicate with each other directly. Alice must firstly send the message to some quantum repeater, and then the repeater resends it to the next one. After $n-1$ quantum repeaters, the message will be received by Bob. Then $\alpha(\mathcal{E}^n)$ is the zero-error capacity of this communication process. Theorem 11 shows that provided n is large enough, $\beta(\mathcal{E})$ can be accepted as a good approximation of $\alpha(\mathcal{E}^n)$.

It was shown in [11] that one-shot zero-error capacity of channel $\mathcal{E}$ with Kraus operators $\{E_i\}$ only depends on the so-called non-commutative confusability graph defined as span$\{E_i^\dagger E_j : i,j\}$. By Theorems 10 and 11, we see that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha(\mathcal{E}^n)$ only depends on the non-commutative confusability graph of $\mathcal{E}_\phi$.

Finally, we present a representation of $\alpha(\mathcal{E})$ in terms of $\gamma(\mathcal{E})$ and $\beta(\mathcal{E})$. For this purpose, we recall from [20] that *transpose channels* of $\mathcal{E}$ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{R}_{P_X} = \Pi \circ \mathcal{E}^\dagger \circ \mathcal{N},$$

where X is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, P_X is the projector onto X, and $\mathcal{N}$ is a normalization map. That is, if the Kraus operators of $\mathcal{E}$ are $\{E_i\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\rho) &= P_X \rho P_X, \\ \mathcal{E}^\dagger(\rho) &= \sum_i E_i^\dagger \rho E_i, \\ \mathcal{N}(\rho) &= \mathcal{E}(P_X)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \mathcal{E}(P_X)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the inverse in $\mathcal{E}(P_X)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is taken on the support of $\mathcal{E}(P_X)$. In general, $\mathcal{R}_{P_X}$ is not trace-preserving, but on the subspace $\mathcal{E}(X)$, $\mathcal{R}_{P_X}$ is a CPTP map. Furthermore, $\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}$ is a CPTP map on the subspace X, and X is an invariant subspace in the sense that $\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}(X) \subseteq X$.

Theorem 12: Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\alpha(\mathcal{E}) = \max_{X\subseteq\mathcal{H}} \gamma_X(\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}) = \max_{X\subseteq\mathcal{H}} \beta_X(\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}).$$

To prove Theorem 12, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 12: Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a super-operator on $\mathcal{H}$ and X an subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\alpha(\mathcal{E}) \geq \alpha(\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}).$$

Proof: $\mathcal{R}_{P_X}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ satisfy the assumption of Lemma 5, so for any states $\rho, \sigma \in D(\mathcal{H})$, we have:

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \|\mathcal{E}(\rho - \sigma)\|_1 \geq \|\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}(\rho - \sigma)\|_1$$

By the above inequality and the definition of $\alpha(\mathcal{E})$, we conclude that $\alpha(\mathcal{E}) \geq \alpha(\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E})$. □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 12.

Proof: First, using Lemmas 10 and 12, for any subspace X of $\mathcal{H}$, we obtain:

$$\alpha(\mathcal{E}) \geq \alpha(\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}) \geq \beta_X(\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}) \geq \gamma_X(\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}). \quad (8)$$

Let $n = \alpha(\mathcal{E})$. This means that there are n orthogonal states $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $\{\mathcal{E}(\rho_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are still mutually orthogonal. Let C be the convex set generated by $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and P the projector onto the support space of C. For any $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i\rho_i$ and $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i\rho_i$ in C, it is easy to check that for any $x \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{E}(\rho - x\sigma)\|_1 &= \|\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i - xq_i)\mathcal{E}(\rho_i)\|_1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n |p_i - xq_i| \\ &= \|\rho - x\sigma\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

and hence C is preserved by $\mathcal{E}$ in the sense of [20]. By [20, Theorems 1 and 2], C is isometric to a subset of the fixed states of $\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E}$. Thus $\alpha(\mathcal{E}) \leq \gamma_X(\mathcal{R}_{P_X} \circ \mathcal{E})$, and we complete the proof by noting Eq.(8). □

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, we studied irreducibility and periodicity of quantum Markov chains. A periodic decomposition technique was developed for quantum Markov chains. Several characterizations of limiting states in quantum Markov chains were given in terms of periodicity, irreducibility and eigenvalues. An interesting connection between zero-error capacity of quantum channels and decomposition of quantum Markov chains was found.

For future studies, an immediate topic is to generalize our results on one-shot zero-error capacity to the case of n-shot zero-error capacity. Treating a quantum channel together with its state Hilbert space as a quantum generalization of Markov chain offers a way to re-examine some fundamental problems in quantum information theory, e.g. super-activation of quantum channels [21], [22]. Furthermore, since quantum Markov chains are a basic model of quantum systems, we believe that the results obtained in this paper can also find applications in various areas outside quantum information theory.

Acknowledgment

This work was partly supported by the Australian Research Council (Grant No: DP160101652) and the Overseas Team Program of Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, and the CAS/SAFEA International Partnership Program for Creative Research Team.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Grimmett and D. Stirzaker, *Probability and random processes*. Oxford university press, 2001.

[2] A. Ambainis, "Quantum walks and their algorithmic applications," *International Journal of Quantum Information*, vol. 1, no. 04, pp. 507–518, 2003.

[3] J. Kempe, "Quantum random walks: an introductory overview," *Contemporary Physics*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 307–327, 2003.

[4] M. Ying, N. Yu, Y. Feng, and R. Duan, "Verification of quantum programs," *Science of Computer Programming*, vol. 78, pp. 1679–1700, 2013.

[5] N. Yu and M. Ying, "Reachability and termination analysis of concurrent quantum programs," in *International Conference on Concurrency Theory*. Springer, 2012, pp. 69–83.

[6] S. Ying, Y. Feng, N. Yu, and M. Ying, "Reachability probabilities of quantum markov chains," in *International Conference on Concurrency Theory*. Springer, 2013, pp. 334–348.

[7] C. Shannon, "The zero error capacity of a noisy channel," *IRE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 8–19, 1956.

[8] R. A. Medeiros, R. Alléaume, G. Cohen, and F. M. de Assis, "Zero-error capacity of quantum channels and noiseless subsystems," in *Telecommunications Symposium, 2006 International*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 900–905.

[9] S. Beigi and P. W. Shor, "On the complexity of computing zero-error and holevo capacity of quantum channels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:0709.2090*, 2007.

[10] A. Kitaev and M. N. Shen, A. H.and Vyalyi, *Classical and Quantum Computation*. American Mathematical Society, 2002.

[11] R. Duan, S. Severini, and A. Winter, "Zero-error communication via quantum channels, noncommutative graphs, and a quantum lovász number," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 1164–1174, 2013.

[12] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge university press, 2010.

[13] B. Baumgartner and H. Narnhofer, "The structures of state space concerning quantum dynamical semigroups," *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 24, no. 02, p. 1250001, 2012.

[14] M. M. Wolf, "Quantum channels & operations: Guided tour," *Lecture notes available at http://www-m5. ma. tum. de/foswiki/pub M*, vol. 5, 2012.

[15] F. Fagnola and R. Pellicer, "Irreducible and periodic positive maps," *Commun. Stoch. Anal*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 407–418, 2009.

[16] R. Carbone and Y. Pautrat, "Open quantum random walks: reducibility, period, ergodic properties," in *Annales Henri Poincaré*, vol. 17, no. 1. Springer, 2016, pp. 99–135.

[17] D. A. Levin, Y. Peres, and E. L. Wilmer, *Markov chains and mixing times*. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.

[18] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.

[19] C. Liu and N. Petulante, "On limiting distributions of quantum markov chains," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 2011, 2011.

[20] R. Blume-Kohout, H. K. Ng, D. Poulin, and L. Viola, "Characterizing the structure of preserved information in quantum processes," *Physical review letters*, vol. 100, no. 3, p. 030501, 2008.

[21] J. Chen, T. S. Cubitt, A. W. Harrow, and G. Smith, "Entanglement can completely defeat quantum noise," *Physical review letters*, vol. 107, no. 25, p. 250504, 2011.

[22] T. S. Cubitt, J. Chen, and A. W. Harrow, "Superactivation of the asymptotic zero-error classical capacity of a quantum channel," *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 57, no. 12, pp. 8114–8126, 2011.